



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,086	07/23/2003	Jeffrey A. Lee	2159-A (FJ-99-39A)	5940
40256	7590	09/16/2005	EXAMINER	
FERRELLS, PLLC P. O. BOX 312 CLIFTON, VA 20124-1706			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	
DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,086

Applicant(s)

LEE, JEFFREY A.

Examiner

José A. Fortuna

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 64-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 64-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/03/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The prosecution has been reopened and the finality of the last office action has been withdrawn in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 13 and 64-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for mixing pulps, i.e. treated and untreated pulps, to make an absorbent sheet/paper does not reasonably provide enablement for adding the pulps to the absorbent sheet as it is claimed, see steps b and c of claim 13. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The scope of the claims as claimed, includes the addition/incorporation of the fibers/pulp to the already formed sheet, which is not what the specification teaches.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 13, and 64-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 13 and 73, the phrase “which is otherwise identical . . .” renders the claims indefinite, because the desired patent protection cannot be ascertained. The meaning of

Art Unit: 1731

“identical” has not been defined in the specification and therefore, it is unclear what property/properties of the other pulp would be within the scope of “identical.” For the purpose of this rejection “identical” would be interpreted as any pulp made with identical/same fibers than the treated fibers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1731

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 13 and 64-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over HU, US Patent No. 6,413,362.

9. Claims 13 and 64-82 are product by process claims and HU teaches a similar product. The product taught by HU includes curled fibers with and curl index falling within the claimed range, greater than 0.15, column 4, lines 31-39, and combined/mixed with identical¹ type of fibers, column 7, lines 29-34. Note that HU teaches that the pulp can be made using any low yield pulping process, which Kraft is within the low yield pulping process and he teaches that other known operations can be done to the treated fibers, if desired, column 7, lines 18-26. HU teaches the use of **Bleached** southern softwood (Pine) **Kraft**, pulp, (incorporation by reference of the teachings of 60/008,994, now US Patent No. 5,843,852) as fibers that can be used in his process, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 7. In the event any differences can be shown for the product -by-process claims 13 and 64-82, as opposed to the product taught by the reference HU, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing unexpected results, see In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). Note that the porofil values claimed in claims 80-82 are within the levels of the products of the absorbent papers disclosed by the reference, see column 7, lines 35-45.

As the afore mentioned claims are product by process claims, it is deemed that "[A]ny difference imparted by the product by process claims would have been obvious to one having

¹ Identical has been interpreted as the same type of fibers, i.e. fibers from the same source.

Art Unit: 1731

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art the burden of proof is shifted to the applicants to establish that their product is patentably distinct, ..." In re Brown, 173 U.S.P.Q. 685, and In re Fessmann, 180 U.S.P.Q. 324.

Further, "[P]rocess limitations are significant only to the extent that they distinguish the claimed product over the prior art product." In re Luck, 177 U.S.P.Q. 523 (1973).

Conclusion


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Absorbent webs with fibers having permanent curl."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


José A Fortuna
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1731

JAF